

**REMARKS**

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated June 17, 2009 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

In the Office Action, claims 12 and 13 are objected to because of the following informalities: In these claims, “display” should, apparently, read “displayed.”

Claims 11-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant’s admitted state of the prior art (hereinafter “AAPA”) in view of Japanese Patent JP 05-107533 (hereinafter “533 patent”).

With this response, claims 11-13 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

Accordingly, claims 11-16 are currently pending, of which claims 1-10 are withdrawn from consideration in this application.

In the Office Action, claims 12 and 13 are objected to because of the following informalities: In these claims, “display” should, apparently, read “displayed.”

Claims 12 and 13 have been amended to address the Examiner’s objection. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection in light of this amendment.

The rejection of claims 11-16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA in view of ‘533 patent is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Independent claim 11 is allowable over AAPA in view of ‘533 patent in that claim 11 recites a combination of elements including, for example, “loading first and second dummy aligning plates onto a table with a predetermined distance therebetween, wherein the first and second dummy aligning plates are formed of glass and are smaller in area by several times to several tens of times than a mother substrate; and unloading the first and second dummy aligning plates and loading the mother substrate with a plurality of image display parts formed thereon onto the table to form seal patterns using the aligned dispenser.”

The Office admits that AAPA does not teach the presence of a second dummy substrate. See Office Action at page 4.

Applicant respectfully asserts that '533 patent does not cure the deficiencies of AAPA. The Office asserts that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art to provide two dummy substrates, one for each of the two substrates that will be joined in opposing contact, and to provide these with alignment marks according to the known prior art process disclosed by Applicant. One skilled in the art would have been motivated to do so by the desire and expectation of providing alignment marks on both dummy substrates simultaneously.

However, '533 patent teaches away from and does not suggest “loading first and second dummy aligning plates onto a table with a predetermined distance therebetween, wherein the first and second dummy aligning plates are formed of glass and are smaller in area by several times to several tens of times than a mother substrate; and unloading the first and second dummy aligning plates and loading the mother substrate with a plurality of image display parts formed thereon onto the table to form seal patterns using the aligned dispenser” as recited in independent claim 11.

Especially, according to the prior art, the mother substrate for fabricating the liquid crystal display panel is practically the same as the dummy substrate 411 except that an operator is used for fabricating an actual liquid crystal display panel. Thus, as the area of the dummy substrate 411 increases, it becomes more and more difficult to load and unload the dummy substrate 411, which can cause a delay in fabrication. Such a delay will slow the fabrication line and thus decrease productivity. In addition, loading and unloading a large-scale dummy substrate 411 manually increases the chances of damage, which increases fabrication cost. Moreover, since additional space is required for the operator to perform the manual loading and unloading of the dummy substrate 411, space use efficiency of a clean room is degraded and facility expenses are increased.

An advantage of the present invention is to provide an apparatus for aligning a dispenser and aligning method thereof that is capable of quickly and easily aligning a dispenser to form a seal pattern using the dispenser.

According to the present invention, even though the area of the substrate for fabricating a large-scale liquid crystal display panel increases, dispensers may be precisely aligned by loading the first and second dummy aligning plates with an area smaller by several times to several tens of times than the substrate. Accordingly, thanks to the easy loading and

unloading of the first and second dummy aligning plates with the small area, the aligning process quickly proceeds with improved productivity. Also, since damage to the first and second dummy aligning plates is prevented, fabrication costs may be reduced. In addition, loading and unloading of the first and second dummy aligning plates having such a small size improves the space use efficiency of the clean room.

Accordingly, none of the cited references, singly or in combination, teaches or suggests the features of the present invention. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of independent claim 11. Claims 12-16 depend from independent claim 11. It stands to reason that the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejections of those dependent claims should be withdrawn as well.

Applicants believe the application is in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911.

Dated: September 15, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

/Eric J. Nuss/  
Eric J. Nuss  
Registration No.: 40,106  
McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP  
1900 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20006  
(202) 496-7500  
Attorneys for Applicant